



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE TEXT OF JOB.

IT is a distinguishing merit of Prof. Budde's original and ingenious commentary on the Book of Job that he has bestowed so much attention on the text. For a fresh start forward in criticism and exegesis we need, not only a more thorough examination of archaeological evidence, but a closer inspection of the text. The grammar and lexicon will also gain considerably from such a course. For many idioms and words linger in our grammars and lexicons which have only a precarious right to be there. Having given some attention of late to the text of Job and Psalms, from the point of view here indicated, I venture to collect the chief corrections which I have been led to make, provisionally of course, in the text of the former book. Some of them are given in a review of Prof. Budde's work which has appeared in the *Expositor* (June-July, 1897), but it may be convenient to special students to have them brought together, with others, in a summary. I should like, however, to mention in the first instance the fairness which Prof. Budde has shown in mentioning his predecessors. Prof. Wellhausen's *Psalter* in Haupt's Bible is, with all its cleverness, so extremely and dangerously deficient in this respect that I feel bound to give all the more credit to Prof. Budde for his graciousness to his colleagues. It is often not easy to find out what has been done by others; it requires time and trouble to discover the books and periodicals which contain the corrections which others have made in the text. Completeness no one can expect to attain; even good corrections are only too

likely to escape one's attention. Probably Prof. Budde's connexion with the *Theologische Literaturzeitung* has contributed to his wide knowledge of English and American literature, but this would not have sufficed without a preceding goodwill for which he deserves our gratitude. One clever, but little known, English writer owes a special debt to Prof. Budde. This is Dr. Bateson Wright, a pupil of Prof. Sayce at Oxford in the days when that versatile scholar still worked at the great Oxford educational machine. This able student, now thrust by circumstances into an English college at Hong Kong, but still (as his most recent work on Bible history shows) keenly interested in critical research, brought out in 1883 a "new critically revised translation with essays on scansion, date, &c."; it was reviewed the following year by Prof. Budde in the influential periodical mentioned above, and justice was done to the acuteness of the author. That the reviewer should also refer to the weak points in the author's scholarship was inevitable. But the point is that a German scholar was found to take notice of the grains of good wheat in the book, undeterred by failings which in a completely trained scholar would have been difficult to pardon. Again and again Prof. Budde refers to Bateson Wright's book in his commentary, and the following are among the textual corrections which he has taken from this source.

Job iii. 16, omit לֹא. vi. 4. בְּעִכְרֵי. vi. 7. וְהַמָּה x. 20. יְמִי חֶלְדֵי. xvii. 11. בְּרִבְרִם אֲתִידָיוֹב. xxxii. 4. מִיתְנִי. xxxviii. 27, אַמְּמָא. xxxix. 18. בְּ[א] נְלִימָם. The second of these corrections has also been made by Castelli in the JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, 1889, p. 286 (not noticed by Budde).

That Prof. Budde should know so little of Grätz's emendations of Job is not surprising. Very few Christian scholars in Germany know much of this brilliant, though (as they may think) unscientific, student, who went on to the very end unweariedly pursuing his high ideals. Several times I have found corrections assigned to the

younger Perles which really belong to Grätz. The few references to the latter which I have noticed seem to me to be secondhand. I find no mention of the many contributions to textual criticism in Grätz's *Monatsschrift*, nor even of vol. XXXVI (1887). This contains a conspectus of Grätz's corrections of the text of Job as far as chap. xxix, which I am surprised not to find included in the posthumous *Emendationes*. Nor have I discovered a reference to the corrections offered by Prof. Gottheil in his review of Siegfried's *Job* in this REVIEW.

I add the following suggested corrections for the consideration of students, especially those who are frankly "reconstructionists" (a brand-new word which I have just discovered in a theological magazine). The reader will readily understand that to mention the numerous points in which I agree with Prof. Budde would be impossible. As a whole I greatly admire his work.

i. 17. For **בשדים** the original story of Job may have had, i.e. either the Kasshites of Babylonia, or the Kushites of Central Arabia; more probably the former, who were no doubt confused with the Kasdim or Chaldeans. LXX. **פרשים**, from **ברושים** (faulty transposition). Hommel wrongly takes this for a reading.

iii. 5. **במו אָרְרֵי יּוֹם**. Read **במו** (apart from **במו אָרְרֵי יּוֹם**). The line (apart from verse 8 a.) was inserted when the line received its present wrong position, because where it now stands **חַשׁ וְצַלְמוֹת** is the subject. Again and again Bickell's suggestions have to be accepted in spite of numerous extravagances, on which Budde is almost too hard. **יּוֹם** for **יּוֹם** as in iii. 8, where Budde greatly errs in rejecting Gunkel's admirable emendation (see *Expositor*, June, 1897).

v. 3 b. **ירקָב אֲקָב**. Read **ירקָב**. Similarly in Prov. x. 7 correct into **ירקָב**, with Krochmal.

v. 2–6, a later insertion, perhaps a variant to iv. 8–11. Budde's correction in verse 7 (**יְלִיד**) is plausible, but scarcely correct. The poet means, Call on the angels if you will; they would reject your unreasonable request ("for trouble is natural to man"), and they have a higher sphere to move in ("and the

flame-born ones take their flights on high"). The **בְּנֵי רָשֶׁק** are the angels; the term suggests the later view of the fiery origin of angels. See *Expositor*, June, 1897.

- v. 5. Even Bickell has failed; he gives “**וְשַׁאֲף צָמָא מִחְלָם**” “and the thirsty is greedy for some of their vinegar” (cf. Ruth ii. 14). I believe the poet to have written **וְשַׁתָּה צָמָא חֲמָרָם** “and the thirsty drinks their wine.” **חֲמָרָם** became **מִחְלָם**, then **מִחְלָם**; then **מִ** became attached to **צָמָא**. This should be taken with the correction of xviii. 9; **צָפִים** will then pass into limbo. The “obscure” stichus (Bickell) should certainly be cancelled. **מִצְנִים** is, of course, a miswritten **מִצְמִים**. **וְאַל** is a miswritten **וְאַל־אַכְלָן**.
- v. 26. **בְּבָלָח**. Read **בְּלִתְחָ** (cf. Deut. xxiv. 2 and Jer. xi. 19, reading **בְּלִיחָ**). Neither Budde nor Dillmann hits the mark here. Cf. on xxx. 2.
- vi. 3. **לֹעַ**. Better **עַלְגָּנָה** (Isa. xxxii. 4). **עַלְגָּה** “to stammer,” is non-existent. In Prov. xx. 25 read **נִימְצָא** with Krochmal and Grätz. But the true reading in Job vi. 3 is probably **נִמְרָצָא** “are vehement.” LXX. **ἐστιν φαῦλα**; cf. vi. 25 **ζούειν φαῦλα = נִמְרָצָא**. See on vi. 25, xlvi. 6.
- vi. 14. Read **הַלֵּא קָשׁ מַעֲפָרִי חַסְדָּךְ אֵל וַפְקָדָת שְׁדֵי עֲבָנִי**. LXX. **ἐπισκοπή**, as x. 12.
- vi. 21. **מְחַתָּה**. A non-existent word; cf. on xli. 25. Read **מְחַתָּה**; cf. LXX. **τὸν τραῦμα**.
- vi. 25. **גַּמְרָצָא**. Read **גַּמְרָצָא** (cf. Targ.), and see on vi. 3, xlvi. 6. The occurrences of **גַּמְרָצָא** should be carefully examined. Job vi. 25 goes with Ps. cxix. 103. Job xvi. 3 stands alone; cf. Ass. *marṣu* “sick,” or “in pain.” Mic. ii. 10 is corrupt. For 1 Kings ii. 8 either read **נִחְרָצָת** (Grätz), or cf. Ass. *arrata maruṣṭa* “a dreadful curse.”
- viii. 17. Follow Merx in preference to Budde (see *Expositor* article).
- ix. 23. **מִפְתָּח**. Read **מִפְתָּח** (Grätz).
- xi. 12. Read **וְאִישׁ נָבוֹב יְלִמְדָר עֵיר פְּרָא יְלִכְרָד** “Even a senseless man may be taught, and a wild ass's colt may be caught” (like the assonance in Job). Perhaps an improvement, both upon Budde's and upon Grätz's correction.
- xii. 2–6. Budde is, I fear, too imaginative; no doubt all critics

are so now and then ! The tristichs (verses 3, 4, 6) all need correction. Bickell rightly makes two tetrastichs, and his corrections and omissions are, I believe, all right, except as regards the fourth line of the first tetrastich ; צְדִיקָה תְמִימָה is against parallelism, nor is לְכַחֵי for probable. I prefer לְקַחֵי חֲמִימָם וּבָר (alluding to xi. 4). [לְקַחְ] was corrupted into שְׁחָק ; also into [לְפִ] was corrupted into צְדִיקָה וּבָר. The editor did his best to make sense of these words ; and poor enough is the result ! Now for the tetrastichs. I will give them in English ; scholars will easily recognize the Hebrew¹.

“ 1. Forsooth ye are [intelligent] folk !

With you wisdom dies out !

But I too have understanding like you ;

My teaching is blameless, pure.

2. The careless man despises Shaddai's times of doom ;

At the appointed season his foot remains firm ;

Prosperous are the tents of the destroyers,

And those who provoke God have security.”

xiv. 4. This late insertion (Bickell, Baer, Budde in his note) took the place of an illegible distich. xiii. 28 is too poor to introduce here with Bickell.

xv. 4. תְּנִינְעַ. Read תְּנִפְרַע (cf. Smend's note on Ezek. v. 11).

xv. 24. Read בְּמַלְאָךְ עַתִּיד לְשֻׁׂרְדָּ. A contribution to angelology.

xvi. 8. Bickell should here be consulted. לְעַד הַיה seems to me a gloss on בְּלָעַד רַחֲם.

xvii. 15. Read פְּאֹתִי with Grätz.

xvii. 17. Omit לִ. The scribe began to write לִילּוֹת (Geiger).

¹ Two points only need be mentioned. In stanza 1, line 1, supply בְּנֵי (Bickell) or בְּנֵי צְדִיקָם (Baer). In stanza 2, line 1, read, not בְּנֵי לְשֻׁׂרְדָּ, but בְּנֵי לְשֻׁׂרְדָּ, i.e. change his תְּנִינְעַ into לְשֻׁׂרְדָּ. For these reasons : 1. תְּנִינְעַ is an imagined plural of נָגָן ; Ps. ix. 10, x. 1, xxxi. 16, where it occurs in Mas. text, are, as Grätz has shown, corrupt. In Job xxiv. 1, which suggested Bickell's correction, the form is נָגָן. 2. Bickell inserts לְשֻׁׂרְדָּ, but does not notice that לְשֻׁׂרְדָּ still exists under a disguise in Mas. text, which has נָגָן לְשֻׁׂרְדָּ. Now n in תְּנִינְעַ (we may neglect the inserted 1) is merely a corruption of לְשֻׁׂרְדָּ. Thus we get לְשֻׁׂרְדָּ, i.e. לְשֻׁׂרְדָּ, after n fell out, and w was transposed to make sense (Baer and Ginsburg, תְּנִינְעַ).

xviii. 9-12. By all means read in the main as Bickell; but substitute צִירִים “pangs” (see Isa. xiii. 8) for צַמִּים, which ought to mean “the thirsty” (see LXX.), but on which the moderns force the meaning “a snare.” (צַמִּים is an imaginary word which ought to be removed from the Lexicon.) Bickell’s insight is here marvellous. κύλωφ and the omission of δέ after δλέσσαισαν are due to Origen (which Budde has not noticed). Verses 8-13 make two tetrastichs. Read verse 8 as in Mas. text. Then continue: יְחֹזָק עַלְיוֹ צִירִים בְּעֵתָה בְּפֶהוֹת רְבָרְגְּלִיו: would easily be omitted owing to רְבָרְגְּלִיו in the next stichus. Differently from Bickell, I omit אָוֹן, which he prefixes to וְאַיְדִים. Mas. text has אָנוֹן, which is perhaps due to אָוֹן in verse 7.

xxvi. 13. Read רָגַע בְּרִיחִי שְׁמִים סִינְרָה הוּא. In verse 12 רָגַע means “he made to start back” (so Siegfried).

xxix. 18. This passage runs thus in Rev. Vers.: “Then I said, I shall die in my nest, and I shall multiply my days as the sand.” This gives a very strange combination of figures, and involves taking סְעַם ‘with,’ as = בְּ ‘in.’ Budde, with the Jewish Midrash and with Delitzsch, substitutes the mythical bird called the Phoenix for the sand, and explains “with my nest” by a detail in the Greek story in Herodotus (ii. 73). But (1) such an allusion seems improbable in a poem so strongly Hebrew in feeling as Job; (2) it introduces a wrong idea—that of the resurrection, of which the *bennu* or Phoenix was a symbol; and (3) it is inconsistent with the context, which requires a tree to be referred to. The LXX. is, I believe, nearer the true text, which seems to have run: וְאַמְרָה תָּקִין אֲגִיעָה וְאַמְרָה בְּקָרְבָּה זְמִים בְּקָרְבָּה, i.e. “And I said, I shall expire as an old man, and like a palm-tree I shall multiply days.” (עַמְּקָנִי for עַמְּקָנִי) is also possible. See verse 19, and read what Tristram says of the palm (*Nat. Hist. of the Bible*, pp. 380-384). The corruption implied in line 2 is strange, but palaeographically not impossible.

xxx. 2. Read בְּלִחִיל “all capacity.” Cf. אֲנֵשִׁיתִיל of capacity,” Gen. xlvi. 6. Budde’s לִחִיל (cf. on v. 26) is less natural.

xxxvii. 22. Read זְהָב “supernatural brightness,” Ezek. viii. 2, Dan. xii. 3.

xl. 19 b. Gunkel's suggestion yet made. But should we not rather change Gunkel's into ? לְשָׁרֶךָ בּוֹ ? The LXX. reading חַעֲשֵׂי לִשְׁחָק can be readily accounted for by palaeographical considerations and the insertion of letters to make sense of a corrupt reading.

xli. 1. Read, with three improvements (as I hope) on Gunkel:

הַזְּהֹתְּבָלְטָךְ נְכֻבָּה 1
גַּמְ-אַלְמָם מְרָאוֹ יְטָל :
מֶלֶךְ יְשֻׁעָרְבִּי יְעַרְעַפְּנָה 2
וְמִ הַוָּא לְפָנָיו יְתִיאָב :
כִּי הַקְּדוּמָו וַיְשָׁלָם 3
מִתְחַדְּשָׁפָטִים לֹא אַחֲר :

The probability of this form of the text is great. The only objection known to me is that it favours a view of Leviathan which is opposed to that which has become traditional, the view that this wonderful monster is nothing greater than—the crocodile. It may open our eyes perhaps a little wider to the popular beliefs of the post-exilic Jews, who were by no means arid rationalists. Compare xli. 2 with iii. 8. Verse 4 is of course a later insertion which presupposes a corrupt form of the text of verses 1–3. שְׁעָרָה in verse 2 corresponds to LXX.'s δέδοικας; cf. xxvi. 13, δέδοικασιν αὐτόν, i.e. שְׁעָרָה.

xli. 25 b. לְבִלְיָתָח “to be a fearless one.” Budde sees nothing suspicious about this. To me it seems weak. Nor am I at all sure of the existence of a substantive חַת. In Gen. ix. 2 read חַתְּתָבָם (xxxv. 5). Here, however, it would be too cheap an expedient to correct חַתָּה לְבִלְיָתָח. Comparing the corresponding line of the next distich, and the correction already made in xl. 19, we should correct, hardly בְּעַל תְּחַת (Gunkel), but בְּעַל תְּחַתָּה (cf. Ps. lxiii. 10, cxxxix. 15). Behemoth is the “prince of the dry places”; Leviathan the “lord of the lower places,” and the “king of all the sons of pride” (verse 26 b).

xlii. 6. Bickell and Budde both see that metre and sense require

a word to be supplied. The former supplies לְעֵני "my random talk," comparing שָׁלַח in vi. 3. But LXX.'s ἐφαύλισα ἐμαυτὸν (*καὶ ἐτάκην*) points to גִּרְאָזִים; see on vi. 3. I agree with Bickell that an accus. to אֱמֶת אֱמֶת is indispensable, and would render "I retract my vehemence." Budde's אֲשֶׁר דָּבַרְתִּי is rather weak.

To justify the title of this little article, I am bound to refer to Budde's treatment of the important subjects of (1) strophes, and (2) the relation of the pre-Origenian Septuagint (represented by the Sahidic Version) to the Hebrew text of Job. I can, however, only state my conclusions, which are (1) that there does appear sometimes to be a tendency to four-line stanzas, and (2) that the omissions of the Septuagint do appear to be sometimes occasioned by marks in the Hebrew MS. used by the translator which indicate that certain passages ought to be omitted. I cannot say that I greatly admire Prof. Budde in his controversial relations with Prof. Bickell, and I should be sorry for the latter to suppose that all English readers considered that the greatest of special students of Hebrew rhythm and metre has been well treated by Prof. Budde.

I conclude with a recommendation of Gunkel's *Schöpfung und Chaos* as a work which, with all its faults both of omission and of commission (see *Critical Review*, July, 1895), is yet very useful alike for archaeological and for textual criticism. It will be desirable for the student to compare his statements, so far as they relate to Job, with those of Prof. Budde, and to put aside every consideration but that of truth. It is not pleasant to expose oneself to charges of rashness and eccentricity from more conservative critics, but it may be necessary, and conservative critics (who are just as anxious for truth as others) may soon come over to views from which they now feel compelled to dissent.

T. K. CHEYNE.